

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-9, 11-19, 21-23, 26-27, and 31-38 are amended. Claims 24-25 and 28-29 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the underlying subject matter. New claims 41-44 are added. Claims 1-23, 26-27, and 30-44 are pending in the application.

Support for new claims 41-44 is found, for example, at page 6, lines 21-29 of the specification.

Each of the independent claims 1, 11, 21 and 31 have been amended to clarify that the active path (e.g., 34a of Figure 1) includes at least first and second active links (e.g., 16a, 16b of Figure 1), each connecting the router (e.g., 12b) to a first neighboring router (e.g., 12a), and that the active path provides reachability by the router to a destination (e.g., 12a or 14) via the first neighboring router. Each of the independent claims as amended also specify the router (e.g., 12b) outputting an update message to a second neighboring router (e.g., 12c) in response to a detected change in at least one of the prescribed attributes of the connected active path and according to a prescribed routing protocol.

Hence, the independent claims as amended clarify that the connected active path includes at least first and second active links connecting the router to a first neighboring router and that the router update message is output to a second neighboring router. Hence, as described in the specification, the router can aggregate dynamic attributes of individual links in order to combine dynamic attributes of the active path, enabling neighboring routers to be notified of dynamic changes in the prescribed attributes of the active paths (see, e.g., page 5, line 26 to page 6, line 9; page 6, lines 16-20; page 8, lines 18-20; page 10, lines 9-27 page 12, lines 28-30; and page 13, lines 8-21).

The foregoing amendments render moot the rejections under 35 USC §103 of claims 1-6, 10-16, 20-26, 30-36 and 40 in view of the EIGRP White Paper in view of US Patent Publication No. 2003/0107992 by Garcia-Luna-Aceves et al. and US Patent No. 5,694,390 to Yamato et al. Examiner Alia confirmed during a telephonic interview with the undersigned on October 17, 2008 that the §103 rejection was intended to include Garcia-Luna-Aceves et al..

Further, the hypothetical combination neither discloses nor suggests the claimed feature of

an active path including *first and second active links each connecting the router to a first neighboring router*, as claimed. To the contrary, both the EIGRP White Paper and Garcia-Luna-Aceves et al. describe routers that are connected by single links. As illustrated in Figures 3 and 4 of Garcia-Luna-Aceves et al., there is no disclosure or suggestion of the claimed active path includes first and second active links, as claimed. Further, Garcia-Luna-Aceves et al. describes calculating a "distance" between a node i and a node j as the sum of link costs along a path (see, e.g., para. 33-34) for a given directed acyclic graph (DAG). Hence, Garcia-Luna-Aceves et al. teaches away from the claimed active link containing first and second active links each connecting the router to a first neighboring router, by adding the link costs in *series* from source to destination..

Hence, none of the applied references, singly or in combination, disclose or suggest the claimed active path including first and second active links each connecting the router to a first neighboring router, where the active path provides reachability by the router to a destination via the first neighboring router. For these and other reasons, the rejection of independent claims 1, 11, 21 and 31 should be withdrawn.

It is believed the dependent claims are allowable in view of the foregoing.

In view of the above, it is believed this application is in condition for allowance, and such a Notice is respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including any missing or insufficient fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a), to Deposit Account No. 50-1130, under Order No. 10-009, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'L R Turkevich', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Leon R. Turkevich
Registration No. 34,035

Customer No. 23164
(202) 261-1059
Date: October 20, 2008